

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **21 September 2006**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-24. Claims 1-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Baisley et al (USPN 6,415,299, hereinafter “Baisley”).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-24 were rejected as being anticipated by Baisley. Examiner avers that the limitations of claims 5, 13, and 21, “wherein creating the action plan from the difference report involves allowing a user to select which actions to take,” is disclosed by Baisley in figures 5A-5D. Applicant respectfully points out that Baisley does not provide any interface for a user to select which actions to take (see Baisley, Abstract, FIGs. 5A-5D, and col. 7, line 55 to col.9, line 25).

In contrast, the present invention provides check boxes in the action plan for a **user to select the portions** of the action plan to implement (see FIG. 8 and paragraph [0044] of the instant application). This is beneficial because it allows user control over the merging of the framework, thereby providing the desired solution. The system of Baisley provides a preconceived solution, which may not be the currently desired solution. There is nothing within Baisley, either explicit or implicit, which suggests providing an interface for a user to select the portions of the action plan to implement.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 9, and 17 to incorporate the limitations of dependent claims 5, 13, and 21, respectively, to clarify that the present invention provides an interface for a user to select the portions of the action plan to implement. These amendments find support in FIG. 8 and in paragraph [0044] of the instant application. Dependent claims 5, 13, and 21 have been canceled without prejudice. Dependent claims 6-7, 14-15, and 22-23 have been amended to correct antecedent basis.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 9, and 17 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-4 and 6-8, which depend upon claim 1, claims 10-12 and 14-16, which depend upon claim 9, and claims 18-20 and 22-24, which depend upon claim 17, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By


Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: 3 October 2006

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1663
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: edward@parklegal.com